

REMARKS

Claims 1-7, 9, 13-16, and 18-22 are currently pending in the subject application and are presently under consideration.

Favorable reconsideration of the subject patent application is respectfully requested in view of the comments and amendments herein.

I. Rejection of Claims 1-7, 9, 13-16, and 18-22 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1-7, 9, 13-16, and 18-22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Nagendran (US 6,731,940 B1) in view of Brody et al. (US 4,670,899) in view of Larsson et al. (US 6,643,307) in further view of Cardina et al. (US 2006/0161626 A1).

It is respectfully submitted that Cardina et al. fails to qualify as prior art to maintain the 103(a) rejection. The remaining reference combination of Nagendran in view of Brody in view of Larsson fails to teach, disclose, or suggest each of the features recited in claim 1.

Examiner cited Cardina et al. (U.S. Patent Publication Number 20060161626 A1) for the first time in the office action dated February 4, 2009. The filing date of Cardina et al. was January 5, 2004. The filing date of the present application was December 12, 2001. As stated in the applicant's representative's response to the Office Action mailed on December 13, 2007, the part of independent claim 1 to which Cardina et al. is cited for was disclosed in the original specification:

“Alternatively, the location of an entry node may be included in the resource identification information provided by the entry node. Accordingly, once the resource identification information is received by the host 40, the host 40 will have the location of the entry node 53 without querying the entry node database.” (See Specification Page 9, Lines 25-29).

Cardina et al. fails to qualify as prior art under 103(a). The remaining references cited by examiner fail to disclose all the limitations present in independent claim 1; specifically, “wherein the location of the entry node is determined based on the resource identification information from the entry node, wherein determining the location of the entry node based on the resource identification information from the entry node includes extracting the location of the entry node from the resource identification information without querying a database in communication with the entry node, the database storing location information.” Withdrawal of the rejection to Claim

1 is respectfully requested.

Independent claim 13 recites similar language to that of claim 1; specifically, “wherein the location of the entry node is determined by extracting the location of the entry node from the resource identification information without querying a database in communication with the entry node, the database storing location information.” Examiner cites Cardina et al. as disclosing this feature of claim 13; however Cardina et al. fails to qualify as prior art. Withdrawal of the rejection to claim 13 is respectfully requested.

Independent claim 19 recites similar language to that of claims 1 and 13; specifically, “wherein the location of the entry node is determined based on the resource identification information by extracting the location of the entry node from the resource identification information without querying a database in communication with the entry node, the database storing location information.” Examiner cites Cardina et al. as disclosing this feature of claim 19; however, Cardina et al. fails to qualify as prior art. Withdrawal of the rejection to claim 19 is respectfully requested.

Dependent claims 2-7 and 9 depend on claim 1. Dependent claims 14-16 and 18 depend on claim 13. Dependent claims 20-22 depend upon claim 19. As independent claims 1, 13, and 19 are believed to be in condition for allowance, withdrawal of the rejections to the remaining dependent claims is respectfully requested.

Claims 11 and 12 were cancelled in response to the office action mailed on April 17, 2007.

CONCLUSION

The present application is believed to be in condition for allowance in view of the above comments and amendments. A prompt action to such end is earnestly solicited.

In the event any fees are due in connection with this document, the Commissioner is authorized to charge those fees to Deposit Account No. 50-1063 [ATTWP273US].

Should the Examiner believe a telephone interview would be helpful to expedite favorable prosecution, the Examiner is invited to contact applicant's undersigned representative at the telephone number below.

Respectfully submitted,

AMIN, TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP

/Sean M. Evans/

Sean M. Evans

Reg. No. 63,756

AMIN, TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP
127 Public Square
57TH Floor, Key Tower
Cleveland, Ohio 44114
Telephone (216) 696-8730
Facsimile (216) 696-8731